

*BEST COPY
AVAILABLE*

Mr. GIBBON, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) (quitting the question).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Norvell Jones, of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, be permitted to remain on the floor during the remainder of the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

Sec. 114. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be used for continuing public safety programs of the Agency for International Development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

In its illustrative 1972 bill, the Agency for International Development requested \$20,433,000 for carrying out public safety programs in more than 25 countries of the world. Of that \$20,433,000 was to be from technical assistance, \$20,573,000 from supporting assistance, and \$3,400,000 from supporting assistance loans.

The proposed program and the detail of its financing are set forth in the table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Countries and regions	Supporting assistance	Technical assistance	Supporting assistance loans	Countries and regions	Supporting assistance	Technical assistance	Supporting assistance loans
Southeast Asia:				Costa Rica.....		\$199,000	
Sri Lanka.....	\$11,148,000			Dominican Republic.....		370,000	
Laos.....	425,000			Ecuador.....		131,000	
Thailand.....	9,000,000			El Salvador.....		56,000	
Philippines.....		\$800,000		Guatemala.....		377,000	
Peru.....		100,000		Guyana.....		59,000	
Ceylon (Sri Lanka).....		1,016,000		Honduras.....		171,000	
Ghana.....		196,000		Jamaica.....		55,000	
Tanzania.....		203,000		Nicaragua.....		91,000	
Tunisia.....		125,000	\$3,400,000	Panama.....		203,000	
Near East and South Asia: Pakistan.....		250,000		Uruguay.....		203,000	
Latin America:				Venezuela.....			
Bolivia.....	115,000			Total.....	\$20,573,000	5,450,000	\$3,400,000
Brazil.....	174,000			Grand total.....			29,423,000
Colombia.....	340,000						

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, over the years, I have come to realize that U.S. participation in the highly sensitive area of public safety and police training unavoidably opens the door to those who seek to identify the United States with every act of local police brutality or oppression in any country in which this program operates. It matters little whether the charges can be substantiated; they are made almost daily; they are widely circulated; they obtain credibility in some quarters; and they inevitably stigmatize the total U.S. aid effort.

I believe that in undeveloped areas of the world, the costs of public safety programs are better left to be underwritten from local resources and the U.S. assistance effort directed toward less sensitive and better justified areas of concern. As a move in this direction, my amendment would eliminate all public safety programs funded from technical assistance grants and development loans. This action would not, however, bar public safety programs in Southeast Asia, for which \$20,573,000 in supporting assistance funds is requested, and concerning which I will not comment at this time.

That program has been widely published in a different connection.

While I question the need for continuing this highly controversial program, the Agency for International Development has testified in strong support of these activities which involve the operation of the International Policy Academy and the stationing of 335 public safety advisers abroad. Having achieved the

limited objectives for which they were established, public safety programs in 23 countries have been terminated since 1962.

Public safety programs in Chile and Jordan were terminated in fiscal year 1971 and ongoing programs in Brazil and Korea will be concluded by the end of fiscal 1972. In trying to justify this program's continuance, an AID official has made the following observation which should be considered in passing judgment on the program:

Violence has been a common factor in many of the world's societies and one which frustrates the effort of the people to realize their aspirations and also of governments in attempting to govern. Violence has been chosen by special interest groups, political factions and elements at both extremes of the political spectrum. Based on the recent experience of the 1960s, it is clear that during the decade of the '70s the task of governments in these societies will be much more important during this period. This importance lies not only in the civil security forces' ability to protect the lives, property and basic human rights of the citizens, but in their ability to create a climate for orderly change. Violence perpetrated by any group in society should be prevented and suppressed.

In several countries, which have requested and are receiving Public Safety assistance, there are reports and allegations that some members of the police forces engage in illegal activity in the conduct of their business. We do not condone and do deplore this kind of behavior which is antithetical to the objectives of the Public Safety program and to the modern concept of law enforcement which the program attempts to inculcate at all levels in police forces it aids. The best chance for overcoming this lack of profes-

sionalism is the conduct of police operations is through technical assistance and training provided by the Public Safety program.

U.S. Public Safety assistance is a low cost, low profile activity. Given adequate resources, it can be effective in instilling police leadership toward the professional and humane use of their resources and it can assist in the development of police abilities to prevent serious threats to internal order.

Unfortunately, there is a difference between can and is. I question the effectiveness of these programs in light of the adverse effects that result from our being so closely associated with local police brutality and consider further involvement in these programs to be against the best interests of the United States.

We have troubles enough with police/community relations in our own society. I suggest that our Government's efforts would be better directed to this, and our own crime problem, rather than to trying to teach foreigners how to run their police departments.

Mr. President, the overall effect of this, together with other aspects of our program, is to identify this Nation with the preservation of the status quo in all respects in all the developing countries, in which there are many people who believe that some changes in their economic or political systems are warranted. The United States is identified in nearly every respect with the preservation of the status quo in any effort to improve the lot of the people in those countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600100006-5

Mr. PROCHORE. The amendment was brought to the attention of the full committee, and we agreed that, because it was controversial with many people, it should be brought up on the floor rather than put in by the committee.

I think it is necessary for us to stop our aid in public safety programs because, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, not only do they become clearly identified with suppression of human rights, but it is with the most reactionary and military regimes.

It is true, as the Senator from Arkansas said, that they may serve a useful purpose, but the Senator from Arkansas would like in his amendment would be to provide that public safety programs and the support of these countries be run with local tax funds in accordance with the way the local governments want to set priorities.

I know that resistance there would be in this country to having a Federal police force. People would resist such a move. I may even hear people say the FBI is that. I don't think so. I have great respect for the FBI. I think it has done a marvelous job. But if we had a Federal police force supported with Federal funds, we would be concerned with all the effects that would have on the civil liberties of the people of our country.

What we are saying is that U.S. AID funds should be used to help countries without becoming involved with their police forces. These have violated human rights time and time again in the most brutal and tragic ways—Brazil is the most conspicuous example. There is no reason why the United States should unnecessarily be identified as the country which is supplying the police force to a Latin order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROCHORE. I support the Senator's amendment.

Once again, I ask the Senator from Hawaii if he will control the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the support of the Senator.

Mr. PONG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. The main thrust of these funds, under the public safety programs, is to have an efficient civil security force in the countries that are just developing. Many of these countries do not have an efficient police force and they need to have trained men to stop the inception of riots and the inception of other criminal activities.

Since 1951 the United States has provided assistance to police organizations around the world through the foreign economic assistance program. We must remember that we have only 4 or 5 more months left of fiscal year 1972 and that we have been operating on a continuing resolution to take care of the programs which are now in existence.

The primary thrust of this program has been to develop the institutional capability of civil security forces to maintain peace and order so that economic and social development can proceed and the affairs of government can be conducted within a constitutional framework.

By providing this assistance, civil police capabilities have been improved, thus permitting recipient governments to cope with internal disorders in their earliest phases rather than having to use military force when such disorders reach an unmanageable level.

Some police actions have been described as brutal. Many police forces in our own country, likewise, have been accused of police brutality. But the main thrust of this program is to see that the recipient countries have efficient police forces so they can nip insipient disorders in the bud, so they do not have to resort to military force later.

This program has been working very well, and it has been phasing out. During this same period the program level for assistance to 30 countries outside Southeast Asia has been reduced from \$7.98 million in 1967 to \$5.45 million in fiscal 1972.

Mr. President, we are talking about a very insignificant sum of money—\$5.45 million to 23 countries.

Which countries and what amounts are we talking about? For example, for the Congo, \$1 million; for Ghana, \$106,000; for Liberia, \$203,000; for Tunisia, \$125,000.

Certainly these countries need to upgrade their police forces.

Likewise, we are appropriating for Jordan, \$65,000. For Pakistan, \$220,000. For Bolivia, \$115,000. For Brazil, \$174,000.

So it can be seen that the amounts appropriated for these countries are modest.

To abruptly terminate all assistance to countries other than those in Southeast Asia at this time would be very unwise and could waste a large part of the limited investment already made in those countries.

The expenditure of this amount of money is for equipment, for training, for bringing their people over to take a look at our police forces so they may learn from us, and for sending our technical advisers to those countries. So Senators can see that most of the money appropriated under this program is for expenditures for our technicians, and for foreigners to come to our country to learn what is happening here.

This is particularly true in terms of the major effort now being mounted to attack the worldwide problem of international narcotics control. AID's public safety program will play a key role in the total U.S. Government effort. It is imperative that civil police institutions be strengthened in order that individual country narcotic control laws can be enforced effectively. Specific plans for assistance to various countries are now being formed in coordination with the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and the Bureau of Customs. Fourteen of these countries are now receiving some type of public safety assistance through AID.

Latin American is also rapidly becoming a major conduit for international narcotics traffic into the United States. Six countries, all in Central America and the Caribbean area and which are now receiving public safety assistance, may also require assistance in narcotics control.

In addition, the Congress has now enacted legislation—section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act—which authorizes the President to conclude drug control agreements with other countries and to furnish assistance to any country or international organization for drug control purposes.

Mr. President, the significant impact of this restriction would be to force the closing of eight international police academies, where nearly 50 percent of the students expected during fiscal 1972 will come from 23 countries. It will result in the abandonment of public safety efforts to work with any but three countries in Indochina. Such assistance must be authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act and appropriated in part I of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act. Therefore, any effort to eliminate public safety activities outside Southeast Asia is contrary to a congressional view expressed so recently.

Opportunities for preventing further spread of international narcotics traffic and growth of related law enforcement problems cannot be disregarded. Although the United States cannot enforce the narcotics laws of another nation we do have a responsibility to assist in an area of national urgency through training and improved organization under the public safety program.

Mr. President, I think we would be doing a very sad thing if we were to disallow the use of this money for public safety programs. It would be most tragic because the main thrust of this program is to really give to the developing countries a good civil police security force in order to hold down the trafficking in narcotics, to nip subversive elements in the bud, and to protect constitutionally developed and elected governments.

So I oppose the amendment very vigorously, Mr. President.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from year to year I have been a very strong supporter of our foreign aid program. I have done so because I have always believed that the effort was made in the spirit of brotherhood, and not in a self-seeking way to promote the prestige or enlarge the image of America throughout the world. We have spent billions of dollars in order to accomplish that.

But I dare say the program that we are talking about now, that has been outlined by the Senator from Hawaii, has been counterproductive. We are talking about a civil police force—First of all, this is a national concern. It is a matter of the sovereignty of the particular nation involved. Those people should furnish their own police forces. They should train their own policemen.

No one is advocating here that they do away with their policemen. All we are saying is, it is not the business of the United States of America to create a police force in any nation to guarantee the tenure of any specific dictator or any particular government. Frankly, in many instances, as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, we have been identified

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600100006-5

Approved For Release 2002/01/10 : CIA-RDP74B00415R000600100006-5

as being part of a sound reform movement that is salutary in that particular country.

We have said time and time again that America should not be the policeman of the world, and yet we are policemen by proxy here. I do not see why the United States of America should maintain an international police school. For what purpose? The last thing any nation does to protect its own security is to build up a good, formidable police force. To say that if we withhold this aid these police forces will go out of existence is something I just cannot believe at all. I say very frankly I think this is one part of the foreign aid bill that does irreparable harm to the foreign aid program as a whole.

We have seen instances time and time again where these civil police forces, as they are called here, have really become stormtroopers. We have had our experience with Hitler, who, piecemeal, wanted to suppress this and suppress that. Finally he wound up as a dictator and brought us into World War II.

I say if we are going to cut this foreign aid bill at all, this is the one best place to cut it, and I shall vote for the cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

As I have stated, the amounts of money here are used for the purpose of sending equipment, of sending advisers over here to teach police work, and to have the students of recipient countries come over and learn some of our police techniques. We are not trying to set up police states in these countries. We are just teaching them advanced methods of civil security and public safety, and that is all we are doing for them.

This work is being phased out. We have operated under the continuing resolution now for approximately 7 months, and we have only 5 months to go. The program outside of Southeast Asia involves around \$5 million. It is being phased out, and this is no time for us to cut it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator uses the expression that this is for "civil security protection" reasons. What do we mean by that? It certainly is not protection against an invader. It is an internal affair.

Mr. FONG. It is an internal affair.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it our business to get mixed up in it?

Mr. FONG. Many of our programs involve internal affairs. We have gotten into the matter of helping people who are starving and who are sick—

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, but that is a different matter. We want to put food in empty stomachs. I just voted against the Fulbright amendment that would affect the award of money to feed the starving people in Southeast Asia. But there is no analogy between food and police.

Mr. FONG. We have sent our advisers over there, and we have brought their people over here, to study educational

methods. This is nothing but a question of education.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not the way I have heard it. I have been with this program for a long time, and this is one element of the program with which I have become very weary. I think it is wrong to support this type of program. All that these security guards have been able to do is protect the location of authority in their particular State. Any time anyone speaks out against that authority, he goes to jail, sometimes without trial, and America is being blamed for it in many instances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I recall the days and the hours and hours spent in the Foreign Relations Committee—

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. During all the time we put in on this measure in the Foreign Relations Committee, to the best of my recollection this subject was not mentioned. I may be in error, but I do not recall it.

I know that this has been referred to as a program which might prevent police brutality. I would like to say it is purely an educational program, in the same way that the FBI trains people, and in the same way as this Congress has appropriated money to assist in training local police. There is evidence of police brutality all over the world, and I am sure it exists in this country. But I think that countries which have systems such as ours, and the more advanced countries in Europe, would be more likely to educate and train these people in ways which would prevent police brutality. I think that is correct.

Also, we are engaged now in a great program throughout the world to try to bring narcotics and drug traffic under control, and this will be one element of the training which will be undertaken. I think many subjects have been discussed here which might be of much more importance, but this is important.

I do not go on the assumption that all our police are brutal. I would think it would be better to train these forces in the use of more humane methods. It is basically an educational program.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I agree with the sentiments of the Senator from Rhode Island. It reminded me of a rather symbolic experience.

I think one of our first involvements in South Vietnam was a thorough public safety project in which we employed Michigan State University. I believe it is the same university of which the present Administrator of AID was president.

We were engaged in teaching them police organization. Mr. Finkel of that school became very friendly with Mr. Diem.

One thing led to another. Diem spent time in the Maryknoll Seminary in New York State and became acquainted with some important figures in this country. He went back and we helped make him president and gave him a police force, and we are still there protecting his people.

It is rather interesting that out of this kind of program grew that very long and intimate connection with South Vietnam.

It is a very important program. It involves us in the internal affairs of many countries. But, for the life of me, I do not understand why the Senator from Hawaii feels that we should become involved in the creation of the local police forces of these countries. I think it now involves 25 countries. It is no small matter.

We already train army officers in more countries than that. We become identified with their police forces and whatever people think of their police forces. We know in this country how popular police forces are. I support our police forces. But we know that in many parts of this country the police are very controversial. I think it is most unfortunate, but that happens to be human nature. We also have become identified with foreign army officers. We bring thousands—and we have brought tens of thousands—of army officers to this country, to train them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 1 additional minute. We bring them here to teach them our most modern methods of how to stifle any kind of disorder or insurrection. That, in its proper context, is an essential part of an organized society.

I agree with and I underscore what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. Essential as these activities are to organized society, they are essentially local, and a big country like ours should not inject itself into these activities. We are being accused by our enemies all over the world of being of an imperialistic nature, seeking now and more subtle ways than, say, the British to control every part of the world we can by investments, by training of their military people, by training of their policemen, and other means.

So I think it is against our interests to keep this program in operation. It is not just a matter of money or saving money. It is against our interest.

I want to correct a misapprehension that I think was implicit in a comment just made, that my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois reduced the amount for the suffering or starving, or what have you, of people. My amendment did not reduce the amount. It only provided that the amount provided should come out of the overall amount in the bill. There was flexibility for the administration to take that amount from other less important activities. I did not want the record to show that I reduced the amount.

February 4, 1972

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. It is a question of how one construes the flexibility. My belief was that it might have to be taken out of a more essential program, and I considered it a limitation in that respect. But I do not pretend for one moment that my heart is any bigger than that of the Senator from Arkansas. I hope he understands that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PENCE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMMILL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARKINS), the Senator from California (Mr. GIBBS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McCORMACK), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MOORE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANKIN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLISON), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MACGONIGAL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CARSON) are on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLISON) is paired with the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANKIN) is paired with the Senator from Washington (Mr. MACGONIGAL).

If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McCORMACK) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELMONT), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HARTMAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HIRSHBAUM), the Senator from Idaho

(Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SANDERSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TART), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWNE), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MURPHY) is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HARTMAN) is paired with the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWNE). If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 31, as follows:

[No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Allen
Anderson
Bach
Bentzen
Bible
Booke
Burr
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Chiles
Cotton
Eagleton
Ervin

Fulbright
Harkin
Holloman
Humphrey
Inoué
Javits
Kennedy
McClure
Metzger
Mondale
Montoya
Nelson
Peyton

Tell
Proxmire
Roth
Specter
Stennis
Stevenson
Symington
Tamm
Tunney
Weicker
Williams

NAYS—34

Alben
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Brock
Buckley
Case
Casper
Cannon
Carter
Dale
Dominick

Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Goldwater
Griffin
Gurney
Hansen
Hart
Leahy
Long
Mann
Miller
Packwood

Pearson
Percy
Roth
Schweiker
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Stallard
Stevens
Thurmond

NOT VOTING—20

Alloft
Baker
Bellmon
Cannon
Casper
Carter
Cotton
Cromwell
Gravel
Harkin

Hartfield
Hirshba
Holloman
J. Carson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Mann
McClure
McGee
McGovern

McIntyre
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Randolph
Saxton
Taft
Tower
Young

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its leading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2507) to establish a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of drug abuse, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12067) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Weicker). The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) proposes an amendment:

On page 2, line 6, strike out "\$165,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000".

On page 4, lines 11 and 12, strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—TIME LIMITATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the pending amendment be limited to 20 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the sponsor of the amendment and the ranking minority member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, although the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee is a far better bill than that passed by the House, it did not reduce the total enough. And now even the committee's modest cuts have been partially offset by the Senate's vote to add \$100 million for the Alliance for Progress.

I offer an amendment to reduce the amount for worldwide development loans by \$50 million, from \$150 to \$100 million, and that for worldwide technical assistance by \$25 million, from \$165 to \$140 million.

My amendment would reduce the total in this bill for the regular foreign aid and military sales items, titles I and II, from \$2,529 billion to \$2,264 billion. This is still \$275 million more than Congress appropriated for these same programs in the 1970 fiscal year. I remind my colleagues that in fiscal year 1970 we had a budget deficit of only \$13 billion. The official estimate for the administrative budget deficit this fiscal year is \$45 billion, and, judging from past experience, likely to go much higher. My amendment will reduce that massive deficit by \$75 million.

The new money appropriated by this bill is, by no means, all that will be available for development lending and technical assistance. Repayments on past loans, carryovers and funds from other sources which will be available for new loans under terms of this bill total \$381 million, which, when added to the \$100 million in new money allowed under my amendment, will make a total of \$381 million for loans outside of Latin America. There will also be \$15 million more